CONRAIL



JOHN K. ENRIGHT, Associate General Counsel

1717 Arch Street, Philadelphia, PA 19103 Phone 215-209-5012 - Fax 215-209-4819 john enright@conrail.com

April 1, 2009

Via UPS overnight mail

Anne K Quinlan
Acting Secretary
Surface Transportation Board
395 E State Street, SW
Washington, DC 20024

Re:

Docket No AB 167 (Sub No 1190X)

Consolidated Rail Corporation Lehigh Valley Main Line

Abandonment Exemption in Hudson County

Dear Secretary Quinlan

Enclosed please find an original and ten copies of Consolidated Rail Corporation's Motion to Dismiss the Notice of Intent to File an Offer of Financial Assistance filed by CNJ Rail Corporation on December 19, 2008

Please time stamp the enclosed extra copy of this letter and return it to me in the enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope

smcerely //

CC

John K Enright

ENTERED
Office of Process"

APR - 2 2005

Part of Public Record

Eric Strohmeyer, V P of CNJ Rail Corporation

Joseph H Dettmar, Esq Deputy Director, Office of Proceedings

BEFORE THE SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD

スペ 98 / / STB NO. AB 167 (SUB-NO. 1190X)



CONSOLIDATED RAIL CORPORATION – ABANDONMENT EXEMPTION – IN HUDSON COUNTY, NEW JERSEY

STB-NO. AB 55 (SUB-NO. 690X)

CSX TRANSPORTATION, INC. – DISCONTINUANCE EXEMPTION – IN HUDSON COUNTY, NEW JERSEY

STB-NO. AB 290 (SUB-NO. 313X)

NORFOLK SOUTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY – DISCONTINUANCE EXEMPTION – IN HUDSON COUNTY, NEW JERSEY

NOTICES OF EXEMPTION

ENTERED
Office of Proceedings

APR - 2 2009

MOTION TO DISMISS NOTICE OF INTENT TO FILE AN OFFER OF FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

Part of Public Record

Introduction

Consolidated Rail Corporation ("Conrail") hereby requests the Board to reject the Notice of Intent to File an Offer of Financial Assistance filed by CNJ Rail Corporation ("CNJ OFA Notice") filed on December 19, 2008 on the grounds that 1) the deadline for filing an OFA has now past, 2) CNJ does not have the requisite financial responsibility to file an OFA and 3) there is no realistic likelihood of rail traffic over the line to be abandoned Sec, e.g., *Union Pacific Railroad Co—Abandonment and Discontinuance of Trackage Rights Exemption—In Los*

Angeles County, CA. STB Docket No AB-33 (Sub-265X), 2008 WL 1968728 (STB served May 7, 2008) ("Los Angeles County")

Background

On December 19, 2008, along with various discovery requests, CNJ filed a Notice of Intent to File an OFA, a Notice of Intent to Participate as a Party of Record and a Request to Toll the Time Period for Fling an OFA in the subject proceeding. Contail responded to the discovery requests on December 31, 2008, explaining that only a small segment of the Line remained under Contail ownership (the "Contail Segment") and that Contail was obligated to sell the Contail Segment to third parties as a result of a court approved settlement. On January 22, 2009, Contail supplemented its response by providing CNJ with a Minimum Purchase Price for the Contail Segment. Contail even accommodated CNJ by meeting Eric Strohmeyer on site to show him the Contail Segment and also to emphasize that it did not connect to any active rail line.

On February 5, 2009, Conrail wrote to the Board indicating that it had fully complied with its discovery obligations to CNJ and that the ten day deadline for submitting an OFA had passed Accordingly. Conrail requested the Board to issue a Decision approving the Notice of Exemption effective as of February 12, 2009 On February 9, 2009, CNJ filed a letter with the Board claiming that Conrail needed to provide the Minimum Purchase Price for the entirety of the Line, not just the Conrail Segment CNJ further advised the Board that it would be filing a motion to compel discovery sometime the week of February 15, 2009 and therefore, requested the Board not to take any action until it filed said motion. On February 11, 2009, Conrail responded by noting to the Board that the Minimum Purchase Price information sought by CNJ related to property that Conrail neither owned nor controlled and therefore, was not appropriate discovery

<u>Argument</u>

OFA regulations – including the deadlines set forth in those regulations – arc to be strictly construed See e.g. Chelsea Property Owners — Abandonment – Portion of the Consolidated Rail Corporation 's W 30th Street Secondary Track in New York, NY – in the Matter of an Offer of Financial Assistance Docket No AB-167 (Sub-No 1094) 1993 WL 274727 * 3 (served July 22, 1993) (OFA deadlines "designed to ensure that railroads would be able to dispose of their property expeditiously and by a date certain") Moreover, the Board does not permit parties to abuse the OFA process See Norfolk Southern Ry Co—Abandonment Exemption—in Norfolk and Virginia Beach, VA, STB Docket No AB-290 (Sub No 293X), 2007 WL 3277033, at *7 (served Nov 6, 2007)

The deadline for filing an OFA was February 1, 2009, ten days after discovery was complete 49 CFR 1152 27 (2) ¹ CNJ has sought to extend that deadline on the pretext that Conrail's disclosures were incomplete. In so doing, CNJ stated that it would be filing a motion to compel discovery during the week of February 15, 2009. More than six weeks have passed since the week of February 15th, however, and CNJ has yet to file either such a motion or an OFA. CNJ cannot toll the deadline for filing an OFA indefinitely through inaction. If CNJ actually believed that Conrail failed to comply with discovery obligations, as CNJ alleged – and which Conrail vigorously disputes – then CNJ should have filed the motion to compel that it stated it would file in its February 9, 2009 letter to the Board. Having failed to do so, CNJ should not be permitted to abuse the OFA process and benefit from its delay and inaction, especially when such delay serves no legitimate purpose and otherwise simply protracts the

¹ Conrail in its letter dated February 5, 2009, mistakenly identified the deadline as February 5, 2009

abandonment process, wasting the resources of both the Board and Conrail See *Chelsea*Property, supra Accordingly, CNJ's OFA Notice should be rejected as untimely ²

Moreover, even if CNJ had timely filed an OFA, it would have to be rejected on its merits. For one thing, CNJ has no credible interest in reviving freight rail service on the Lehigh Valley Main since it owns no rail assets and conducts no rail operations. *Maryland Transit Admin —Pet for Dec Order*, STB Fin. Dkt. No. 34975, 2008 WL 428198, *1 n.3 (served Sept. 19, 2008) ("*MTA*"). For the same reason, CNJ simply cannot demonstrate that it has the "financial responsibility" required to sustain an OFA request. See 49 C. F. R. § 1152. 27(c)(ii)(B).³

Even if CNJ had a genuine interest in reviving freight rail service on the line – and the financial ability to do so – an OFA would be baseless because there are no shippers, and there have been none for over a decade. Even in the cases like *King County* and *Roaring Fork* where the Board has found that there was insufficient evidence of firm shipper commitments to conclude that a freight rail operation could be viable, there was *some* indication from actual shippers in the vicinity that they were actually interested in freight service. *King County*, 3 STB at 634, 641-42, 1998 WL 452837, *1, 5-6, *Roaring Fork*, 4 STB, at 120, 1999 WL 323347, at *3 Here, there is no recent rail activity, there are no shippers in the area, and there is no evidence that there will be shippers in the area. Further, providing freight rail service over

² Even if CNJ had timely filed a motion to compel, such a motion would be utterly without merit CNJ indicated that it would ask the Board to compel Conrail to produce information regarding the Minimum Purchase Price for property that is no longer owned by Conrail Such a request is absurd and improper on its face

In addition, as Conrail has shown in a submission filed today in another proceeding, CNJ is not an operating company and, according to a report from the New Jersey State Business Gateway Service, has been "DISSOLVED WITHOUT ASSETS" Conrail's Reply to Notices of Intent to File An Offer of Γinancial Assistance at 8 (filed in STB No AB 167 (Sub-No 1189X, Consolidated Rail Corporation - Abandonment Exemption - In Iludson County, New Jersey) (quoting report)

the right-of-way would be a physical impossibility since it is stranded right of way, unconnected to any active rail service

Lastly, the Conrail Segment is to be sold shortly to third parties as part of a court approved settlement in a Superior Court of New Jersey, Law Division, Hudson County, action entitled Liberty Storage LLC v Metro Realty Corp and GXR Auto Body Corp v Consolidated Rail Corporation et al (Docket NO L-3309-005) Accordingly, Conrail would not be able to convey its interest in the Conrail Segment without being in violation of said court approved settlement Therefore, even if the Conrail Segment were suitable for restoring rail service, it is not freely alienable under the OFA process

Conclusion

The purpose of an OFA proceeding is to continue freight rail service over a line. The Lehigh Valley Main Line has been out of service for many years and is no longer connected to active railroad right-of-way CNJ has neither the intention nor the financial capacity to provide freight rail service on the Lehigh Valley Main Line Morcover, even if CNJ did have the requisite intent and ability, there are no shippers on the line and no infrastructure to support freight service Accordingly, the Board should dismiss the CNJ's OFA Notice as well as its Notice to Participate as a Party and request to toll this proceeding

Associate General Counsel

CONSOLIDATED RAIL CORPORATION

1717 Arch Street, 32nd Floor

Philadelphia, PA 19103

(215) 209-5012

Dated April 1, 2009

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 1st day of April, 2009, a copy of the foregoing Motion to Dismiss the Notice of Intent to File an Offer of Financial Assistance was served by UPS overnight delivery to Eric S Strohmeyer, Vice President, COO of CNJ Rail Corporation, 81 Century Lane, Watchung, NJ 07069

John K Enright

Associate General Counsel Consolidated Rail Corporation